LETTERS

ON

POPERY.

LETTERS
ON
POPERY:
BEING A
VINDICATION
OF THE
Civil Principles of PAPISTS.

By COSMOPOLITA, and Others.

——— I will nothing extenuate,
Nor aught ſet down in Malice.
SHAKESPEAR'S *Othello.*

DUBLIN:
Printed by R. ENNIS, Bookſeller in Thomas-ſtreet,
1775.
[*Price a Britiſh Six-pence.*]

ADVERTISEMENT.

AS there are many who unhappilly think that the religious Principles of Papiſts are totally irreconcileable in a political View with the Maxims of Government, in a Proteſtant Country; it may not, perhaps, be unpleaſing to them to ſee that their Popiſh fellow-ſubjects are not only not debarred from co-operating with them, for the common Good of our Country, without exerciſing any undue and improper Influence for the Propagation of their Syſtem of Religion, but likewiſe that the true and real Principles thereof (of which they are not inſenſible) do moſt effectually engage them to demean themſelves in ſuch a Manner, as to render them truly uſeful and valuable Members of Society.

LETTERS ON POPERY, &c.

LETTER. I.

Quod Verum atque Decens.——————HOR.

THERE is not ſuch an inexhauſtible ſubject in the world as RELIGION;—and yet there is nothing which is, or ought to be more ſimple in its nature, and beneficial in its effects. The various paſſions and prejudices of mankind, give to that mode of religion which they are reſolved to condemn and proſcribe, a deformity which does not, perhaps, if well examined, belong to it, and by ſtubborn calumny, irritate the profeſſors of it, ſo as (by a very natural conſequence) to excite in them, as men, a diſlike, and perhaps an antipathy againſt thoſe, who, in the full face of day, inceſſantly impute the moſt odious tenets to them;—ſuch, indeed, as would fully juſtify the utmoſt exceſs of legal re-

ſtraint and ſeverity. This is the kindly influence of religion perverted, which, in every mode of Chriſtianity that I know of, exhorts, or at leaſt ſeems to exhort to *univerſal benevolence*.

The writers againſt Popery have exhauſted themſelves in endeavouring to render it utterly odious and abominable, not only in a religious, but even in a civil light, by ſome hiſtorical facts, ſcattered here and there, by the ambition of ſome Popes, in former ages, who graſped at *undue power and authority*, becauſe it was *incautiouſly left within their reach*. But if they deal fairly, they cannot ſurely, from actions that are and have been diſapproved and cenſured by the ableſt champions of Popery, collect its ſum and eſſence, and pretend to form a catechiſm for Papiſts which they openly hold in contempt and abhorence. Were I to tell an *honeſt man* that deceit and villainy are his *real principles of action*, would he not call me an impertinent Blockhead for my pains ?—And what idea can an honeſt, generous, charitable Papiſt entertain of him who tells him, that he is obliged, by the *real tenets of his religion*, under pain of eternal Damnation, to commit the moſt ſhocking, the moſt atrocious Barbarities, that would diſgrace the ſavage Indian, bred up to ſlaughter, and nurtered up in blood and carnage ?—He will anſwer him mildly, as a good Chriſtian, that his inſtructors never taught him any ſuch doctrine; but on the contrary, inſiſted on *univerſal Charity to all men* as indeſpenſible a duty, as to love God, their common Creator.

I beg I may give no offence when I aſſert, that there are many Papiſts in this kingdom, whoſe notions are as enlarged and unprejudiced as thoſe of any Proteſtant. who ſtill perſevere in what they conceive to be a ſound Religion ; but this certainly would not happen did they know themſelves to be really hampered with tenets which would actually render them

monſters

monſters in ſociety. They read a long liſt of *imputed doctrines*, at which they ſhudder, but ſtill they recur to theſe tacid queſtions ?—*Was I ever taught this by thoſe whoſe profeſſion it is to teach ?—Did I ever find this in any book containing the real doctrines of my Faith, properly authorized and enforced as ſuch by my Church ?* —On the contrary, ſhould a clergyman dare to recommend ſuch tenets, I well know what would be his fate, a perpetual baniſhment from that place which ſhould never reſound but with the neceſſary benevolent ſweetneſs of the Goſpel.

It is not by tales of *pope Joan*, *Antichriſt*, and chimerical inventions of a heated or prejudiced imagination, that ſenſible people are to be gained over; they may ſerve for amuſement at the fireſide to *judicious Proteſtants, and Papiſts*, who are better inſtructed than to give themſelves any *real concern* about the fooleries of the illiterate and vulgar. The Papiſt will not attempt to draw up another's catechiſm, nor will the candid Proteſtant. He will look upon the Papiſt as an *honeſt Man*, if his actions prove him to be ſuch; and if otherwiſe, he will deſervedly call him a *villain*, without recurring to the fooliſh and diſingenuous expedient of diſgracing his religion, by tacking the word *Popiſh* to it.

Ye happy few! whoſe minds are elevated far above the little arts of prejudice, who ſee clearly thro' the miſt of chimeras that ſurround you, come and take up arms with me—the arms of plain ſenſe and reaſon,—to exterminate, if poſſible, all religious antipathy!—The deſign is truely noble; and *ye alone, of all Mankind*, are qualified to make the glorious attempt.

COSMOPOLITA.

LETTER II.

——— *Veteres avias tibi de pulmone Revello.*
HOR.

NOTHING is more obſervable than when prejudice of any kind has once gained the aſcendant in the mind, the ſlighteſt apparent proofs are but too ſufficient to corroborate and eſtabliſh it therein. Such is the fatal error incidental to human nature, the parent of many others, and ſuch the deceitful veil that diſguiſes truth againſt all the ſtruggling efforts of reaſon, although engaged in the inviting and delightful cauſe of charity and humanity. There is nothing, therefore, more worthy of the true chriſtian and philoſopher, than to endeavour to extinguiſh the remaining ſparks of *theological hatred*; that devouring fire, which has ſo often conſumed and deſtroyed in our hearts that unlimited philantrophy, ſo eſſential to the very name of a chriſtian.

The Papiſts of this kingdom are in many reſpects in a ſtrange ſituation; becauſe ſome of their foreſathers were wicked and cruel, or, * as others will have it, not ſo meek and patient as, indeed, it becomes all Chriſtians to be, the preſent race of Papiſts, who are, in general, in the view of the whole world, a ſet of harmleſs, innocent people, muſt be loaded with their iniquities, and by this ſecond ſpecies of *original ſin*, be damned to detenation and abhorrence, notwithſtanding all their endeavours to be *cleanſed* from it. It is ſtill ſtranger, that becauſe they are well affected, and ready to prove their loyalty to his preſent Majeſty, they muſt be reviled and reproached with

* *See Hiſtorical Memoirs of the Iriſh Rebellion, by I. C, M. D. extracted from Parliamentary Journals,* &c.

Rebellion of 1641

with owning a Sovereign at the other end of Europe. Some indiſcreet and flattering Divines have aſcribed to the Papacy many mighty powers and prerogatives, of which no Papiſt living is obliged to take any notice. The French are certainly Papiſts, and yet whoever would undertake to teach the depoſing power, or pretend to derogate in the leaſt from the rights of Kings, in all temporal affairs, among them, would not be likely to meet with very tractable Diſciples; on the contrary, impriſonment or baniſhment would be the ſole reward of his extravagant zeal for the Papacy.

The Papiſts of Ireland are too ſenſible of the bleſſings of our happy conſtitution, to have the leaſt deſire of undermining it, for the ſake of a mere *ſcholaſtic diſpute*, and they are too wiſe to forſake the ſubſtance for a ſhadow. They do not ſhare indeed in all its bleſſings, but experience muſt convince us, that it is a ſmall indulgence and lenity, that will render a Papiſt happy and thankful.

Whoever reads hiſtory likewiſe, with that attention which is requiſite for ſuch a ſtudy, will find, that Kings themſelves encouraged, or perhaps were the primary authors of thoſe high pretenſions in temporal matters, which ſome Popes arrogated to themſelves, as the privileges of their See. We find ſome Princes who humbly implore permiſſion to invade the neighbouring States, under ſome pretended religious pretext, and thus demean themſelves in aſking what no power on earth could grant. While this *chimerical prerogative* was of ſervice to them, they aſked leave in a very *cordial* manner to plunder their neighbours. However ſome of them ſmarted pretty well by the rod which they themſelves had put in the Pope's hands, for the *charitable* purpoſe of ſcourging thoſe who had never offended them, but by poſſeſſing ſome territories which happened to pleaſe them; like a man who endeavours by every *crooked method* to take

to himſelf a ſpot of land, which he wiſhes to have added to his own garden. This affords a ſtriking picture of human nature. How fond are we of every inſtrument of our paſſions, and how do we execrate it, when it happens to be turned againſt us?

Thus it was with Princes, whilſt they who managed this new *religious* and *political* engine for their own uſe and purpoſe, extolled and magnified it in the higheſt degree; declaring all thoſe enemies to the church, who reſiſted the Pope's Bulls, (ſuch as they were:) they, on the contrary, who were to be the ſufferers, very naturally and juſtly exclaimed againſt thoſe exorbitant pretenſions, of which they, nevertheleſs, would have made their own uſe, if a fair occaſion offered, and had they not been unluckily engaged in a quarrel with Rome.

Hiſtory informs us alſo, that when any contention aroſe among the Potentates of Europe, they frequently recurred to the Pope, as their common arbitrater. What room did they not give him, by this conduct, to make him adopt the notion, that he was not only the *religious*, but alſo the *political* father of all Europe?—Had Sovereigns acted with leſs rapacity, and more prudence,—had they not ſharpened the ſword which they could eaſily foreſee might be turned againſt themſelves, with *equal dexterity*, by their antagoniſts,—had they totally confined within themſelves the deciſion of all political matters; it ſeems impoſſible, that a man ſtrictly limited to *religious* affairs, ſhould ever be able to erect himſelf into ſuch a coluſſus in the *political* world; nor would any Eccleſiaſtic, unleſs he were a fool or a knave, pretend to make his court by caſting crowns and ſceptres under the Pope's feet, in either of which caſes his folly would be ridiculed, or his knavery be puniſhed. At preſent this huge coloſſus ſubſiſts only in idea, and it is unreaſonable that the image of it ſhould terrify us as much as if we ſaw it hanging over our heads.

For

For this we need no other proof than the News-papers, which clearly inform us, that the Pope is not only frequently contradicted, but even insulted, by those who nevertheless profess the strictest attachment to the Romish communion.

What is, then, the so much dreaded Papal power reduced to in our days?—To advise the Popish Clergy and Laity to live like christians, and give good example to all their neighbours. To this may be reduced the whole sum of the circular letter which was sent by the present Pope, * and translated into English, for the benefit of those who are curious enough to know what he recommends to those of his communion throughout the world. If it be absurd to fear a shadow, it is certainly as absurd to fear or hate those, the majority of whom know not whether any such Papal pretensions as I have spoken of ever existed in the world. Their instructors, it seems, never thought it a breach of their duty to teach them, that the Pope had all the crowns and sceptres in the world at his disposal: they content themselves barely with advising our countrymen of the Popish communion to "fear God, and honour the King."

COSMOPOLITA.

* *CLEMENT* XIV.

1775

LET-

From Lydney

LETTER III.

YOU have lately given to the Public two letters written in behalf of the *Papiſts* of this kingdom, and ſigned, *Coſmopolita*; In this you evinced your own impartiality, and proved it was not your deſire (any more than it can be that of any rational perſon) they ſhould be condemned unheard. I applaud the maxim; it is founded on the ſtricteſt juſtice, and the moſt commendable philantrophy; and I am confident, after an impartial examen of whatever can be urged in their defence, the whole bulk of Papiſts in Ireland will be found to conſiſt of two claſſes only,—the *deceivers* and the *deceived*.—The *impoſers* and the *impoſed-upon*.

In which of theſe claſſes your correſpondent, *Coſmopolita*, is to be ranked, I cannot yet decide: but this I know, he is the moſt decent, candid, and rational advocate for thoſe of the Romiſh faith, who hath appeared in print within my memory; and, let his motives for writing be what they may, he deſerves a reply; both from the calm and diſpaſſionate manner in which he writes; the great ſemblance of truth and reaſon which appears in his letters; and the hurt to the unwary Proteſtants which may reſult therefrom. If he is a *deceiver*, and promulgates doctrines foreign to his thoughts, and contradictory to his knowledge; it ſhall be my taſk, to ſtrip off the veil and ſhew the fallacy of his arguments. If he is one of the *deceived* and his heart dictates to his pen, then chriſtian charity obliges me to undeceive him, and through him every deceived Romaniſt who may read my letters. I flatter myſelf I am equal to the taſk, ſince my poor abilities, aided by TRUTH alone, muſt be ſufficient to overthrow error in every mind unhardened by obſtinacy.

In

In the prosecution of this necessary undertaking I shall lay aside all prejudice, all rancour, and every spark of *theological hatred*; which I detest as much as *Cosmopolita* can possibly do. Let us both plead our cause at the bar of *reason*, and let irrefragible TRUTH pronounce the sentence. I shall produce no witness, but what himself shall own to be competent; I shall bring no charge without unimpeached evidence for its realty. From *Cosmopolita* I shall expect my answers, or from writers like him; for I here declare I will not vouchsafe a reply to any hot-headed zealot, or firebrand declaimer.

Cosmopolita's first letter in your Paper of the 22d July, begins with a just censure of those "who are "so actuated by prejudices and passions; that they "impute tenets to that mode of religion they re-"solve to condemn and proscribe, which would ju-"stify the utmost excess of legal restraint and seve-"rity."—He infers that those who have written against Popery have been so actuated and that the tenets imputed to that faith have been falsly rendered odious and abominable. He allows that this imputation hath arisen from "some *historical facts* scatter-"ed here and there, by the ambition of some Popes "in former ages, who grasped at *undue power and* "*authority*, because it was incautiously left within "their reach." But he adds, "*these bad actions* are, "and have been disapproved and censured by the "ablest champions for Popery." He denies that "the *real tenets of the Romish religion* oblige the pro-"fessors, under pain of damnation, to commit the "most shocking, the most attrocious barbarities." And affirms that "his instructors never taught him "any such doctrine, but on the contrary, *insisted on* "*universal charity to* ALL *men*."

Cosmopolita next proceeds to say that, "there are "many Papists in this kingdom whose notions are "as enlarged and unprejudiced as those of any Pro-

"testant.

" teſtant."—This I allow, as *Men*, and while there is no neceſſity to exert eccleſiaſtical authority; but let them once find that to be neceſſary, I will prove that, as *profeſſors of the Romiſh religion*, they *muſt* think otherwiſe.——That is, that whenever the eccleſiaſtical rulers command them to act in conformity to the *real* tenets of their faith, they muſt obey, or ceaſe to be of that communion. He adds, " that " Papiſts ſhudder at a long liſt of *imputed Doctrines*, " which they declare they never were taught by their " clergy; not could they find them in any book con- " taining the *real* doctrines of their faith, *properly* " *authoriſed* and enforced by their church."

In his next Letter in your paper of Auguſt 8, *Coſmopolita* continues the ſubject. He ſays, " the Pa- " piſts of this kingdom are, in many reſpects in a " ſtrange ſituation; they are loaded with the iniqui- " ties of their foreſathers, and are not indulged as " their meek and harmleſs behaviour deſerves, tho' " they endeavour to *cleanſe themſelves* from this ſe- " cond ſpecies of *original ſin*," and from thence infers that the Papal authority is now " a huge coloſ- " ſus, exiſting only in idea; and that the Papiſts " may be ſafely truſted with every immunity and indulgence beſtowed on their Proteſtant fellow-ſubjects.

The account he gives of the riſe of the antient Papal power is very pictureſque, and very juſt, but I believe he muſt own, that the decreaſe of that power is more owing to the preſent enlightened ſtate of men's minds, than from any relinquiſhment thereof by thoſe who would doubtleſs be glad to poſſeſs it in all its former extent.

Upon the whole, he ſtrives to eſtabliſh two facts; —the one, that the *real tenets* of the Romiſh church do not oblige the Papiſts to ſeek the deſtruction of Proteſtaniſm; the other, that there can be no danger from putting the Papiſts of this kingdom on an abſolutely equal footing with the Proteſtants. Both theſe points

points I deny; as I doubt not to prove, to the satisfaction of *Cosmopolita* himself, that they are founded on falsehood.

In order to settle the first point, I shall not recur to any history of a past transaction. I shall not rip up any old stories of a *Parisian* massacre, the bonefires of Smithfield, the Croisades against the Albigenses and Weldenses, the Revocation of the edict of Nantz, the persecutions in the Cevennes, the butcheries at Thorn, the case of the Dissidents in Poland, nor the present proceedings against the Protestants in France. No, let them all be buried in oblivion. I will deduce the REAL *tenets of Popery* from their true sources—*the canons of the Council of Trent*, and the *creed of pope Pius*, which contain the articles of the Roman Catholic faith, and are the rule to which every Catholic must adhere.

That I may proceed with regularity, and have no occasion to go back, I beg *Cosmopolita* will answer, with his usual candor, the following queries.

1. Was not the Council of Trent the last œcommunical Council held under the authority of the Romish Church?

2. Are not the canons of that council, with those of former councils, confirmed thereby, obligatory on every individual in the Romish Communion?

3. Does not the Creed of Pope Pius contain the sum and abstract of the REAL Roman Catholic Faith?

4. Do not those canons and that creed contain every obligatory decree of the Romish church?

5. Is not every Roman Catholic bound to believe and conform to the decrees of his church?

6. May not every tenet in the above-mentioned canons and creed be fairly, justly, and charitably said to be a tenet of the whole body of Papists, and of every individual Papist in the world? And,

7. Does

7. Does not any man ceaſe to be a Papiſt, by diſallowing of any tenets of his church?

I eſteem *Coſmopolita* as a man of learning and candor. There are, doubtleſs, many thouſand Papiſts who never heard of this council of Trent, and may have taken up their faith from the Manuals; Sum of the Catholic Faith; Catholic Chriſtian inſtructed; and ſuch other books as are publiſhed for their guidance and direction. In which, the authors, of thoſe eſpecially which are printed in Proteſtant countries, will take care to inſert no doctrinal point which may be ſhocking to the eye of a Proteſtant magiſtrate; and which, whilſt things are in their *preſent ſituation* may not be neceſſary to inculcate. But, *Coſmopolita* has more ſenſe and more knowledge, than to think theſe books contain ALL the tenets of the church. He muſt know there are *others* which if occaſion offered, could be produced; ſuch as would turn the preſent *milk* to bitter *gall*; and a people long enured to a blind ſubmiſſion to church decrees, would heſitate but little to obey others, when they were ſhewn, they ſprung from the ſame authority, with thoſe they had hitherto believed. If *Coſmopolita* knows this, he is bound in candour to confeſs it; if he does not, I will charitably make it manifeſt to him.

SYDNEY.

LETTER

 From Cosmopolite

LETTER IV.

——Projice tela manu sanguis meus! VIRG.

IT were, I think, a curious disquisition, and worthy our attention, to examine and search into the almost *impenetrable* nature of that wonderful quality, which is dignified with the name of zeal. This, by some, is considered as essentially and inseperably annexed to RREIGION, whether good or bad. Others are so apt to look upon it as a very *dangerous* ingredient, in the composition of those whose *intellects* are remarkably frigid, in proportion to the degree of *heat* which is occasioned by this *mystical* addition to religion, that they think it were much better for the world, if every man were content to *go his own way*, without endeavouring to regulate his neighbour's head and heart by his own *barometer* of zeal; and to this latter opinion, I must confess, I have an irresistible tendency to subscribe.

I believe we may define zeal (especially in the sense of those who felicitate themselves in possessing a large quantity of this *inflammatory* ingredient) to be a *headstrong, extravagant. and unjustifiable eagerness to propagate our own (at least) seemingly religious opinions.* This point being settled, let us now proceed in this curious and interesting subject, and examine whether it were not better for this world, as well as the next, to explode this *fiery impulse*, which, in general, I think, does not direct us to the best pursuits, nor *greatly encourage* that kind and fraternal disposition, which alone can make us truly virtuous and happy in our present state of existence.

To what pursuits, then, does zeal generally conduct us? does it confine itself within the narrow circle of each individual for himself alone? and does it

only urge every man in particular to take care of his own *little world?* if this were the caſe, I ſhould be ſo far from having any quarrel to it, that I would rather encourage it, as the incentive to good and worthy actions; but, alas! it is unhappily of ſo *active* a nature, that it is as difficult to reſtrain it, as to prevent a houſe on fire from being conſumed. Whoever could undertake to ſtop the devouring progreſs of the flames with one bucket of water only, may alone hope to quench this *fire*, and keep within bounds this *maddening* quality. A prudent and mild degree of zeal, indeed, is ſo tempered with ſweetneſs and moderation in admonition, and even in reprehenſion, that I have no difficulty to exempt it from any blame or cenſure.—I have been highly charmed with the converſation and ideas of ſome *eminent zealots*, in their reſpective religious profeſſions, who, by the uſe of ſome *ſcriptural* expreſſions which they adapted to the diſpoſitions of their *hearts*, as the ſkilful taylor adapt the lining to the cloth, had formed in themſelves ſuch a profuſion of zeal, that they might be truly ſaid to be *eaten up with it*. Could I have been induced to give up my underſtanding *cordially* into their hands, I doubt not but I might, in time, become a tolerable proficient therein; but it is, unluckily, of ſo frigid and ſtubborn a nature, that all the *warmth* and *energy* of their diſcourſes, could not impel me to be initiated in their myſteries. I happened likewiſe to be, unfortunately, ſomewhat verſed in hiſtory, which contains ſo many doleful accounts of the miſchiefs and misfortunes of our unhappy ſpecies, which I could plainly ſee were owing to the *ſuperabundance* of this ſo ſtrongly recommended quality, that, in my humble opinion, the world, at leaſt *at this time of day*, ſhould endeavour to get rid of it as faſt as it can; and the means to facilitate this happy change, are in every body's hands, and fitted to all capacities, if uſed without partiality or prejudice, as hiſtory is a much

much plainer instructor than any other whatsoever. But, for the honour of human nature, it were to be wished that no other books should ever fall in our way, but those harmless compositions which form the delightful amusements of our tender years; such as, *Dorastus and Faunia, the seven wise masters*, and the like. Those, which are said to be composed for the *instruction* and *edification* of *children of a larger growth* (as *Pope* has it) are so replete with tragical accounts of their *manly* exploits, that they furnish sufficient matter of *uneasy detestation* to every man of a humane turn of mind, who may be justly allowed to be a *man*; and who has a proper sense of the real inherent dignity of a rational being. That these effects, or at least the most of them, among the folks who called themselves CHRISTIANS, are to be attributed to excessive zeal, it is what evidently appears to every clear-sighted reader. This *heavenly* impulse set them about making a *hell* of this world, and transformed a number of otherwise very quiet, harmless, and loving people, into a frightful group of demons.

All have been culpable in their turns; since we may find the same destructive and poisonous influence in a wofull degree, wherever zeal has been active and busy, in exterminating *peace* and *concord* for the *love of God*, and the *honour of his holy religion*, where even the practical parts of religion were totally neglected, and sometimes, perhaps, the *speculative* not much attended to, *in secret*; yet still the human passions of every kind, found a wonderful resource in this fatal and deplorable quality, and the *principal managers* were but too well seconded by many others, to concur in every scheme, broached by *hypocrisy*, to serve the vilest purposes of *ambition* or *vengeance*. Alas! what dismal and direful scenes! how replete with horror, for the view of meek-eyed humanity! I am happy in the notion, that this is the

favourable time for a ſincere and cordial union (I ſpeak not of ſpeculative points) but in thoſe that are practical, which is the baſis of all the peace and happineſs we can expect to enjoy. Whether proteſtants or papiſts, let us unanimouſly reject whatever may tend to foſter enmity, or foment diſcord. If the latter renounce them to every impulſe of this kind, why ſhould they not, as men, be received into the pale of kindly compaſſion, and chriſtian charity? as a man, the *friend of my ſpecies*, I ſincerely wiſh, that the voice of cruel unchriſtian rancour, from whatever quarter it proceeds, may be ever ſilenced with contempt, or drowned by the united efforts of reaſon and humanity.

COSMOPOLITA.

P. S. I have met with a letter in your paper, under the ſignature of *Calvin*, to whom I ſhall only ſay, in return at preſent, that papiſts do not want for their *Calvins*, their *retailers* of maſſacres and ſlaughter, who can furniſh out as diſmal tales as he could poſſibly do; but this is abſolutely foreign to my purpoſe and inclinations, for my *imagination* is ſomewhat more *humanized*, and not quite ſo much *delighted* with objects of horror, as his appears to be.

LET-

From "Calvin

LETTER V.

The insidious smile upon the cheek should warn us of the canker in the heart.

JUNIUS.

THIS was the language of an *Englishman*, when he spoke of the *Scotch*;——and this should be the language of a protestant, when he mentions a papist. That I am not wrong in my remark, this paper shall bear testimony. The duty which I owe to the purest of religions, now calls on me to stand up in her defence;—she is illiberally attacked by a jesuitical assassin, and a comparison drawn which disgraces her dignity. In the day of danger, he is a brave man who steps forth;—but in the dark hour of hypocrisy, there is something more than spirit necessary. In ambuscade we must fight with caution, and when treachery is in view, keep a watchful guard. It is not every man who is proof against the wiles of a bigot, or can perceive the deep designs of a popish advocate;——the honey of rhetoric can sweeten a sentiment, and the poison of the mind be swallowed in flattery. These are the alarming opiates which lull suspicion to sleep; and these the formidable enemies which every credulous heart should dread. Dear bought experience has wrote in our minds, in characters of blood, the spiritual *lenity* of popish power;——and the conscience which dictated one horrid massacre, whilst it yet remains under the same authority, will never internally altar its principles. The religion of *Rome* is founded in superstition;—the materials of her church are a compound of absurdities;—her children are implicit slaves to an undeviating and uniform hatred to all other sects;—and whenever the holy zealots can find an opportunity, then do they burst

burſt forth with vengeance on their enemies. The ties of nature are forgot —humanity is diſſolved ;— their breaſt is inflamed with the fire of enthuſiaſm ; —and yet, wonderful to tell ! in the midſt of this dreadful conflagration of the paſſions, the gentle breath of *abſolution* can whiſper peace to their ſoul, and enſure happineſs hereafter.

That the farce of a conteſt might be properly kept up, the *patriotic Sydney* becomes an antagoniſt, and enters the liſts with as much ceremony as if the proteſtant and the popiſh religions were two horſes who never ſtarted againſt each other before. The match thus made, *Coſmopolita* mounts, gives his nag a ſpur, takes the lead, and is followed by *Sydney* ;—the news paper is the courſe, the public the ſpectators, and *honour* the reward. Let us now examine how they have performed, and change the ſimile to its proper channel. *Coſmopolita* harrangues on the bleſſed proſpect " of all controverſy heing over ; that a philoſo- " phical candour begins to reign ; that he is the re- " conciling peace-maker,"—who will bring the lamb and the wolf to drink at the ſame fountain, without animoſity ; and then he concludes with a fine panegyric on the *gentleman-like, and ſcholaſtic* virtues of his opponent. *Sydney*, on the other hand, begins where *Coſmopolita* left off—that is, by complimenting his adverſary——and ſo regularly gradates to the acknowledgement of the happy effects which muſt ſpring from the reconciliation of differences ; and then ſhews his *ſcholaſtic* education, by quoting the tenets of the popiſh church, and telling us what was done at the different councils of *Conſtance*, *Lateran*, &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. tranſactions, which, to uſe my learned *friend's* phraſe, are quite *utopian* to the anſwer he ſhould have given.

I will give you my opinion of *Sydney*.——He is a writer who can put a few ſentiments of politics together in a decent order, in which he generally takes

care

care to remind us of his *learning*; but he has not one nervous thought to beſtow—one ſoft, ſtealing expreſſion, which will make its way to the heart. He is diſcordant in the muſic of his language, though he ſtrikes every key of his grammar.

Without a very minute diſcuſſion of the tenets of the popiſh doctrine; without ranſacking the hiſtory of *Rome*, or quoting her religious diſputes; we need go no farther back for the character and ſentiments of theſe people than to that bloody period in this country, when theſe barbarous and inhuman butchers unlocked the ſecrets of their breaſt, and gratified their horrid thirſt for human ſacrifices: then their deſigns threw off the maſk of hypocriſy; the holy murderers, reeking with proteſtant blood, appeared at the altars of their church, with a grinning ſneer of horrid joy. Not ſatisfied with barely depriving of life the innocent victims of their vengeance, they put even the child, which their barbarity forced in an untimely moment from the womb, to the torture of impalement; they ſtuck upon ſpikes, they hung up by the arms, by the neck, by the feet, men, women, and children, indiſcriminately. The ſhrieks of beauty,—the cry of mercy,—the pitiful calls of expiring nature;—nay, the very infants who had juſt taſted the cup of life, could find no compaſſion. The inhuman dogs licked the ſluices of their exiſtence, even to the laſt drop which cloſed the bloody ſcene.

Can we take the offſpring of theſe monſters to our boſom? can we fold in our hearts the profeſſors of a faith, whoſe religion teaches them to glory in ſuch a work as this? nature forbids it.—The ſyſtem of humanity muſt change firſt;—the lion forget his ferocity;——or the papiſt diſavow his *holy mother church*. I know the arts that are uſed to reconcile *theſe* bigots and open-hearted churchmen together; even all the men in the kingdom have eſpouſed the whole, and weakly been led to believe, that theſe ſons of

ſu-

ſuperſtition were become rational beings;——but, thanks to the virtuous majority of the lords, all ſenſe of former injuries was not forgot; they remembered, and juſtly too, the implacable hatred of the prieſthood; and that they behold every miniſter of the proteſtant faith, as depriving them of their bread; which opinion, as a right reverned prelate obſerved, "will never ſubſide while the cauſe remains;" and that cauſe will, I hope, never be removed.

CALVIN.

LET-

 Fr Cosmopolita

LETTER VI.

A *RELIGIOUS* dispute is of all others the most unnecessary, and ridiculous at certain times and circumstances, especially when conveyed through the vehicle of a *new's-paper*. After much time fruitlessly spent therein, and to the great consumption of ink and paper, the antagonists are apt to be surprized, when good sense comes to preside at their romantick attempts, to effect in a few sheets of paper, what so many numberless gigantic folios have laboured in vain to compass; the bottom of all religious controversy is dark and deep, by the unceasing industry of each party, to heap argument upon argument, and by considering the same object in so many different points of view, that the real original matter of debate is frequently lost in a cloud of wandering subtleties. It is the wish of an ideot to draw all mankind into the same religious system in every respect, while there are so many authors of weight and merit to promote their respective opinions, to bias the mind on every side of the question. But there is no impossibility as I can conceive of all sincerely uniting in *one political creed*, if every party would freely renounce to extravagant and intemperate zeal, for their particular mode of religion, and cordially bend their attention to promote with united efforts, the general good of their country; if they would labour to be good subjects, and virtuous citizens; a great declension of blind and foolish enthusiasm throughout the world, seems to promise peace and rest to mankind; this bane of religion has lost it's deadly power to poison all the sources of human tranquillity and happiness. Is there any man so great an enemy to his species, as not to wish for an increase of union and harmony among

his

his countrymen in *political* matters, if we put the affairs of the *other world* entirely out of the question? If there be any such who obstinately foments the fire of unnecessary discord in his own breast, he exactly resembles the well-known *Jack* in *Swift*'s ingenious performance. A late writer (if he deserves that title) has assumed his *name* and *ferocity*, but without the smallest pretence in the world to his learning and knowledge. Who revealed the mighty secret to him, that *Cosmopolita* designed to embark in a *religious* controversy? It is quite plain and manifest, that he understood not the purport of *Sydney*'s letter, nor those of the former, though it is possible a man of common sense, with no great stock of learning could not mistake it. If his understanding be defective, it is no fault of either of the writers, and he ought to be at the trouble of repairing it himself, if there be any hopes of the attempt being crowned with success. I have formed many conjectures with regard to this *angry* writer, which I submit to the judgment of the public. In his first letter he speaks so much in the stile and phrase of a *horse-jockey*, by his ingenious simile brought quite fresh from the *Curragh*, that at first I set him down for such in my mind, but I doubt this conjecture will not be found very valid, if we reflect that in the view of many good judges, he has been lately most shamefully *thrown out* in the race, when he ventured to bring his dull heavy steed, "*as* "*stiff and stately as a lord-mayor's horse*" into the field against some running cattle, much more adapted for winning the prize. I have been credibly informed by men of undoubted veracity, that when in that disgraceful position, he was incessantly casting *dirt* at some of the spectators, who advised him to quit the field, and not to spoil the sport. My next conjecture is, that he is a *musician*, for he plays so many harmonious tunes upon words, metaphors, &c. and seems to understand so thoroughly the difference between

harmony

harmony and *discord*, that I ventured to imagine he might be a son of *Orpheus*, but one *small* difficulty remains, that I have been solemnly assured by some eminent practitioners in that way, that he hath no right conception of any instrument he strives to play upon. My last conjecture, I believe, will be found more solidly grounded, which is that he is a *butcher*. It is remarkable, that tradesmen love to talk after the stile and manner of their respective trades; thus they are as well known in a mixed company, as if they were actually employed at their several occupations; and does not *Calvin* express himself so forcibly in the usual phraseology of a butcher, does he not hold forth the *insignia* thereof to publick view, in such a manner that to assign him any other trade, were as absurd as to put the *awl* into the *weaver's* hands, and the *shuttle* into the *cobler's*? His mangled exhibitions of *blood* and *slaughter*, the visible delight and pleasure he takes in talking of his trade, the well-known scene of dogs licking up blood, which he undoubtedly brings from his own slaughter-house, all conspire to make my opinion at least very probable; nor can I recollect any circumstance. but what will serve to confirm it. It may happen that I may have some dealings with him in *his way*, but I earnestly request, that he will not send me the thigh of a child, instead of a leg of mutton, for although to my great surprize, as I have been informed he delights exceedingly in *human* flesh, my stomach would prove perhaps too squeamish to relish his *dainties*.

This man (let his trade be what it will, I am sure writing is not) asserts that he has triumphed after *mistaking* the matter in *every* circumstance, and without endeavouring even at a shew of argument. * This able

* *This formidable antagonist in a very short and trivial letter, brags of having silenced the controversy,*

able general after performing nothing worth any notice, and in the midſt of a very precipitate retreat, begins to ſtun our ears with the cry of victory. Can he think, that this abſurd ſtratagem will impoſe upon even the moſt ignorant and injudicious of his hearers? at the ſame time he very politely abuſes his countrymen for *ignorance* and *obſtinacy*, if this country had the hononr to produce ſo eminent and accompliſhed a writer. I ſhall ſay no more of him at preſent, but that he has very abſurdly obtruded himſelf into the preſent conteſt, wherein the whole ſum of his abilities and talents, can only render him an object of contempt and ridicule.

COSMOPOLITA.

verſy, and, very politely, taxes the inhabitants of this country with incurable obſtinacy. Erit mihi magnus Apollo.

LET-

 Jm Moderator

LETTER VII.

WHILST a ſkirmiſhing war is carried on between the polite *Sydney*, and the judicious *Coſmopolita*, concerning the Roman Catholics; and each, though temperate, warm with the ſpirit of his party; permit a ſtranger to their paſſions, diveſted of favour or malice, and intirely unconnected with the political or polemical cauſes of the debate, quietly to enter the liſts and hazard a few remarks, drawn from the unerring fountain of paſt and preſent experience; which, if read without prejudice, and examined with candor, cannot fail of ſetting the points of diſcuſſion in their true and genuine light.

It has been obſerved, that *ſtanders-by* ſee more of a game, than thoſe who play;—that is, diſpaſſionate, diſintereſted people, attentively liſtening to a diſpute, in the event of which they have no concern, are more likely to detect fallacy, or diſcover truth from the arguments on either ſide, than the parties themſelves, heated by mutual oppoſition, and more willing to conquer than to be convinced. The intrinſic value of the prize is often of no moment to the competitor; to win is their chief aim.

Profeſſing myſelf totally unconnected with the debates of *Coſmopolita* or *Sydney*, whatever may be the iſſue, I ſhould have left thoſe genteel and gallant Antagoniſts in the entire poſſeſſion of the field, if a malignant Huſſar had not irregularly broke in on the combatants, attacking both with an acrimony unbecoming a fair and generous enemy, under a ſignature which is, indeed, expreſſive of his diſpoſition; *Calvin* being ever eſteemed the moſt ſpiteful and gloomy of all that meddled in the buſineſs of reformation.

It is not my intention to paſs any judgment on the religious, or ſpeculative opinion of Papiſts; or to decide whether they are agreeable, or contrary to the plain doctrines of chriſtianity; that taſk I reſign to the doctors of either ſide, who ſeem beſt qualified to maintain truth on one hand, or detect falſhood on the other; my buſineſs ſhall be only an endeavour to ſeperate the inſidious animoſity of party, from the zeal of true religion; and diſtinguiſh what the misfortunes of the times have unhappily blended in ſuch cloſe compact, as to preſent but *one* idea, where the cauſes are, in reality, as different as two originals could produce.

Moſt writers, on what is called the popular ſide, have perpetually attributed ſome poſitive, political evils, emerging from natural, intereſted, and merely common motives to a ſet of religious opinions, which abſtractedly conſidered, could never in themſelves be productive of ſuch events. For inſtance; the frequent attempts of the Iriſh Papiſts, to ſhake off the Engliſh yoke, though no more than many nations have done, at almoſt every period of hiſtory, are ſtill injudiciouſly charged to religion; when examples can be ſhewn, from the annals of all countries, that a ſtruggle for liberty and political advantages, were the only things meant by the conteſt. As to the grand rebellion in 1641, the moſt impartial writers allow that an adherence to the royal party in this kingdom, was the original deſign of the leaders, though the flame of hoſtility gave riſe to acts deteſtable to reaſon, religion, or common ſenſe. Could any thing leſs than murder and robbery be the offſpring of ſuch an ignorant and licentious rabble, as uſually follow camps in the heat of civil war?

Popery is aſſerted to be incompatible with political liberty.

But how ſhall we reconcile the preſent exiſtence of free Popiſh republics, and Proteſtant deſpotic go-

vern-

vernments, with ſo crude an idea? Are not the commonwealths of Venice, Genoa, Lucca, and St. Marino, in Italy, part of the Helvetic confederacy in Switzerland, the Griſons and Valtelines in Savoy, with the ſtate of Reguſa in Dalmatia, all of the Popiſh perſuaſion; whilſt Ruſſia, whoſe ſubjects own neither papal ſupremacy or infallibility, with the reformed kingdoms of Denmark. Sweden and Pruſſia, groan under an oppreſſive tyranny, nothing inferior to that practiſed in France, Spain, or other Romiſh countries? How, therefore, can religion produce ſuch effects as are contrary to its genius, were that poſition to be allowed?

If we examine our own hiſtory, will it not be found, that the Britiſh Laws and Conſtitution, whereof we are ſo jealous, and make ſo great boaſt, were founded in the very boſom of Popery, and at a period when papal Authority and ſuperſtition are ſaid to have obſcured the whole Chriſtian world, and blinded the human judgment?

What were the barons, who ſo long conteſted the encroachment of the crown?—*Papiſts.* What was King John, who gave the famous *Magna Charta*, and generouſly enfranchized the whole realm of England? —A moſt bigotted Papiſt.

To deſcend to the preſent times, who expelled the Jeſuits, and raiſed the firſt ſtorm againſt that great bulwark of papal tyranny, when they oppoſed the liberties of the people, and the juſt rights of their Crown?—The kings of Portugal, France, and Spain, all zealous aſſertors of the Romiſh doctrine.

And what are the brave Corſican nation, who have for more than forty years ſtruggled, and ſtill ſtruggle for that idol Liberty, againſt the powers of Genoa, and now againſt thoſe of France, and wading through oceans of blood and danger, even in oppoſition to declared papiſt of their own perſuaſion in every

tittle? Are they not to a Man, moſt bigotted to the church of Rome?

Having ſo fully proved my aſſertion, that the Popiſh faith of itſelf, has nothing to do with forming this or that reſolution; and its profeſſors may be good or bad ſubjects, in common with other men, and that ſpeculative opinions neither render them factious to government, or tyrannical in their notions. I ſhall take leave, with a continuance of my political creed, concerning the Papiſts, till a more able pen ſhall deign to convince me.

MODERATOR.

LET-

LETTER IV.

I HAVE read *Cosmopolita's* two letters, published in your Papers of the 22d of July; and the 8th of August; if you think the following remarks on them may promote a public or private good, by inserting them in your useful Paper you will oblige

A friend to civil and religious liberty.

PERSECUTION, or hatred of others, merely on account of a difference in opinion in religious matters, is just as rational as it would be, because we have not the same countenance or stature; it may make men hypocrites, but can never make them honest, better christians, or men: thus far I have the pleasure to agree in sentiments with the author of the above letters; and I do most cordially agree with him also in his very just representation of the beautiful simplicity, meekness, charity, and benevolence of genuine christianity; but I must, at the same time, remind him, that it is to the reformation, the art of Printing, and other circumstances, that we are indebted (as instruments in the hand of providence) for the revival of this beautiful idea, which was miserably obscured for many centuries before that period. If, in those times of ignorance (and for so long a continuance as is evident from history) all its attendant evils of error, bigotry, superstition, and persecution, at sundry times, and upon sundry occasions, crept in and defaced the purity of the christian religion, ought we not to be thankful for having been born in better times, and under more favourable circumstances, and improve the advantage by correcting the remains of those bad impressions which prejudice, inattention, and an almost settled aversion to fre-

free and impartial enquiry ſuffers to remain on the minds of many, as if it was really an hereditary evil?

I alſo further agree with the author, that Popery is reformed from what it was, where the reformation is eſtabliſhed; which naturally flows from the intercourſe and connection of its profeſſors with Proteſtants, and the informations received from them, which they cannot ſo well enjoy in Popiſh countries; and I am pleaſed the author ſo candidly admits, that a reformation may ſometimes be neceſſary, and is (according to his account) accompliſhed in his own church; for which, howevever, he ought to thank the Proteſtants, who ſhewed them that good example. Whether this is ſincere, or only compulſory, I ſhall not take upon me to determine; I do believe that the Papiſts of this kingdom (eſpecially the more ſenſible part of them) are very well-meaning people, and do not think the Popiſh religion contains any principles of perſecution which they are obliged to believe; but this is not always the caſe where Popery is eſtabliſhed; and I muſt beg leave to inform the author, that though Proteſtants do not pretend to make creeds for Papiſts (they reſign that work to the vain boaſters of infallibility) yet they do ſay, they can inform them what that creed is which their pretended infallible has made for them; and they do further ſay, that ſo much of this creed is taught as can be inforced, or is ſuitable to the times, and no more; and that part of the Popiſh policy, which prohibits the reading of heretical books, and diſcourages a free enquiry, keeps them ignorant of the remainder except a very few; and even theſe few are ſo accuſtomed, from their education, to believe what their church dictates, that they are not very ſolicitous in their examination of them; and reſt ſatisfied in any flimſy diſtinctions and gloſſes that may be neceſſary for the preſent time.

That

That foundation doctrine, the infallibility of the church of Rome, contains in it the seeds of its destruction, and with it, of Popery altogether; which shews how imperfect all human compositions are; for they who believe this doctrine must acknowledge that they are bound to believe and practice all that this infallible guide dictates; so that, however repugnant these dictates may seem in an enlightened age, to all their ideas of genuine religion, good sense, and humanity, yet they must either receive them for undoubted truths, or renounce that main pillar of their support; so that they cannot reform from what they formerly were, if they act consistently, without beginning at this doctrine of infallibility, and owning it to be an error, which I make no doubt will, in time, be the case; until then, no Protestant can depend on the temporary professions, or sentiments of its professors. This is not the case with any other denomination of christians; if they have erred, they can reform; and therefore, if they formerly practised what they now condemn, there is nothing in their principles that can make us doubt the certainty of that change for the better.

As a proof of what is above asserted, let us consult this infallible dictator; however different the sentiments of Papists may be on this subject, yet all of them agree, that a general council and Pope united is this infallible guide, and here follows some of their determinations.

The fourth general council of Lateran, can. 3. says, If the temporal Lord, being required and admonished by the church, shall neglect to purge his territories from heretical faith, he shall be excommunicated by the metropolitan and his suffragans; and if he neglect to give satisfaction within a year, this shall be signified to the Pope, that he, from henceforth, may pronounce his subjects discharged from their obedience, and expose his territories to be enjoyed by Catholic;

tholics; who, have exterminated the heretics, shall possess it in the purity of faith, so that no injury be done to the principal Lord, who doth not oppose his procedure; provided, notwithstanding, that the same law take place against them who have no temporal Lords."

The same council decrees "that they who under the badge of the cross, will set themselves to exterminate heretics shall enjoy that indulgence, and that holy privilege which is granted to them who go in defence of the holy land; and that is, full remission of all their sins which they confess, and for which they have been contrite, and a greater degree of everlasting happiness than others may expect." Council lat. Quartum, to. 11. p. 149.

The third general council of Lateran under Alexander the 3d, 1179, chap. 27, speaking of certain heretics therein mentioned, says, "let all men know who any way stand bound to them, that as long as these heretics persist in their iniquity, they are released from all fealty, homage, and obedience due to them."

John Huss was summoned by the Emperor Sigismund to appear before the general council of Constance to Bohemia, who promises he would receive him into the safeguard and protection of the Empire, and commands all princes of his dominions to permit him freely to come thither, stay and continue there, and to return from thence; but, notwithstanding this, he was thrown into prison, which being done in the Emperor's absence, he returned to the council, argued the case with them; upon this they make the following decree, and poor Huss is condemned and executed for heresy; the decree is in the 19th session, in these words: "This present sacred Synod declares, that by whatsoever safe conduct granted by the Emperor, Kings, or other secular Princes to heretics, or such as are defamed for heresy; and by whatsoever

ver bond they have obliged themſelves to the obſervation of it, no prejudice can ariſe, no impediment ought or can be put to the catholic faith, or rather eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction, but that (notwithſtanding the ſafe conduct) it may be lawful for any competent and eccleſiaſtical judge to enquire into the errors of ſuch perſons, and duly otherwiſe proceed againſt them, and puniſh them, ſo far as juſtice ſhall require, if they ſhall pertinaciouſly refuſe to revoke their errors; yea, though they come to the place of judgment, relying upon ſuch ſafe conduct, and would not otherwiſe come thither; nor does he, who ſo promiſes, remain obliged in any thing, having done what lies in him.'—Bin Council, t. 7. p. 1074.

The ſame general council of Conſtance declares, "that being a general council, it hath power immediately derived from Chriſt, which every perſon of what ſtate or dignity ſoever he be, even his Holineſs himſelf, is bound to do obedience to, in matters which concern faith, the extirpation of the preſent ſchiſm, and the reformation of the church."—Council Conſt. ſeſſ. 4, 5. The general council of Baſil, in the 2d ſeſſion, renews the ſame decree; and ſeſſion 12th doth challenge, "by virtue of the Omnipotent God, immediate power over all faithful chriſtians."—Council Baſ. ſeſſ. 12th bin. 3. p. 39. and ſeſſ. 33d. they declare this to be "a doctrine of the Catholic faith, which he that pertinaciouſly reſiſts is a heretic."—Ibid ſeſſ. 33d. p. 95. And ſeſſion 45th they add, "that it is an article of faith which cannot be neglected. without the loſs of ſalvation."—Ibid epiſ. Synod, p. 139.

The general council of Conſtance alſo decrees, that "all heretics, all followers, and defenders of them, or partakers with them, though they ſhine in the dignity of Patriarchs, Queens, Dukes, or any other Eccleſiaſtical or Mundane title, ſhall be pronounced excommunicated in the preſence of the people

ple every ſunday and holy day; and that the Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and Inquiſitors ſhall diligently enquire concerning them, who hold, approve, defend, dogmatize, or receive ſuch heretics as they before had mentioned, of what dignity, ſtate, pre-eminence, degree, order, or condition ſoever they are, and if they be found guilty or infamed, by their authority ſhall proceed againſt them by the puniſhments of excommunication, ſuſpenſion, interdict, as alſo of deprivation of their dignities, offices, and benefices eccleſiaſtical, and alſo of their ſecular dignities and hohonours; and by any other penalties, ſentences, eccleſiaſtical cenſures, ways or manners which they ſhall judge expedient, even by taking and impriſoning their perſons, and executing upon them any corporal puniſhment with which heretics uſed to be puniſhed according to the canonical ſanctionst."—Coun. Conſt ſeſſ. 45, apud bin. to. 7, p. 1125.

And, to conclude this liſt, the creed of Pope Pius the 4th, which was eſtabliſhed by the council of Trent, and is binding on all who profeſs the Popiſh religion, in the 24th and laſt article, ſaith "I do alſo, without any doubting, receive and profeſs all other things that are delivered, defended and declared by the ſacred canons and general councils; and chiefly by the council of Trent; and all things contrary to them, and all hereſies whatſoever, that are condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church, I do likewiſe condemn, reject, and anathematize."——Vide council l'abb. 14. p. 944. 945.

There are a great number of decrees of general councils, and of provincial councils innumerable to the ſame purpoſe, but theſe, I ſuppoſe, will be ſufficient to convince the author that Proteſtants are not ſo void of candour in their repreſentation of Popery as he imagined; if the picture be diſagreeable, let him remember by whom the original was drawn, and be thankful that Proteſtants condemn ſuch practice,

tices, as inconſiſtent with the religion of Chriſt, and that it is their principle not to hate others becauſe they differ from them in religious matters.

N. B. The author would do well to inform the public, when and where the above laws and practices were condemned by the ſame authority that eſtabliſhed them; and whether the perſecutions in France, Germany, Italy Spain and Portugal, were ever condemned by the ſupreme authority of the church of Rome; or any of them excommunicated for deſtroying heretics; till he can do this, he ought to be ſilent on a ſubject; the examination of which is by no means friendly to the Popiſh religion; and I beg leave to aſſure the author, that Proteſtants do not wiſh to abridge Papiſts of their civil and religious liberties further than may be neceſſary for their own ſafety; they know what they had ſuffered by the above Popiſh laws in time paſt; they find they are ſtill in force, if they could be put in execution; and cannot be certain but this would be the caſe, did a proper opportunity offer; nor can they ever think otherwiſe while that doctrine of infallibility is profeſſed by Papiſts; when they give up that doctrine, then we may depend on them; but until then we muſt take care of ourſelves, and endeavour to preſerve our own civil and religious liberty.

LET

LETTER IX.

Aderunt paccare baci viirtutis amore. HOR.

IT may, perhaps, be looked upon by ſome of an *elopia ſcheme*, to endeavour to reconcile the various intereſt of mankind, which, by the aid of religion, *falſely underſtood*, have been rendered ſo jarring and diſcordant to each other. However, as cool reflection, at prdeſent, ſeem to ſuſpend, in a great meaſure, the heat of controverſy, and a philoſophical candour begins to reign, where, unhappily, the force of prejudice had weakened that of reaſon, the intention of a reconciling peace-maker may not be totally void of effect. It were to be wiſhed that divines of all religions had this object (the ſure and permanent foundation of all human tranquility and undiſtinguiſhing fraternal affection) as much at heart, as the incultivating of the particular duties of the goſpel. I know that many bend their attention this way; and all are ſenſible, that to eſtabliſh peace and concord where it was not before, is the moſt worthy, the moſt exalted object that can employ a kind and chriſtian zeal. This is the only motive that has prompted me to a cool and candid diſquiſition of popiſh tenets, as far as they relate to *civil* matters, and *temporal* concerns, in order to prove, that whatever their obedience and ſubmiſſion be to the ſee of *Rome*, in merely *ſpiritual* affairs, it does by no means claſh with that reſpect and ſubordination to the king and the laws which is requiſite to form the good citizen, and the worthy member of the comnunity.

If it appears, then, that there are more than a million of our fellow-ſubjects in this kingdom, who are as honeſt and harmleſs as the general corruption of

of human nature throughout the world will allow, whose only crime is in believing only one mystery more than protestants will admit of, and in practising certain rites and ceremonies which cannot affect the peace and welfare of any state, will they not appear as objects rather of compassion than abhorrence, especially if we reflect upon the numberless discouragements and hardships they labour under? the cause of them are deemed by the humane and candid no longer to subsist: what motive, then, can be alledged to hold papists in abhorrence, who, in many respects, suffer as much as if treachery, villainy, rebellion, and every other species of monstrous depravity, were necessarily and inseperably annexed to popery alone, in opposition to the many examples of honour, justice, probity, and humanity, which we may every day meet with among people of that communion—to their own necessary feelings, as men, which cannot be suppressed—and repeated abhorrence to the actions and characters of those who disgraced their religion by cruelty, rapine, and injustice. Papists have no reluctance to give up to condemnation and censure all those of their persuasion, who, upon a fair and candid disquisition, appear to deserve it: all they contend for is, not to impute their wickedness to *principle*, but to the constant and uniform effects of human passions, which, when not restrained, will operate equally on all, in defiance to the dictates of religion, conscience, and reason.

It cannot but give a most rational pleasure to every man of a kind and benevolent turn of mind, that the unhappy days of furious, blind enthusiasm are at an end. The misrepresented papist may now attempt to justify himself to his candid and impartial fellow-subjects, who will not, surely, refuse to make *a* friend and a brother of a pretended enemy. If any misfortunes attack the former, he can now, with a most pleasing security, fly to the sheltering and consoling arms of

his proteſtant friend, and, inſtead of deteſtation and reproach, meet with relief and comfort. This ſeems to be the happy time of mutual forgiveneſs and oblivion for all thoſe events occaſioned by enthuſiaſtic influence, and the fatal violence of the paſſions.

There are, however, a few, perhaps, who ſtill endeavour to force a tenet upon papiſts, to beget a eternal doubt of the ſincerity of all their proteſtations, however urged with all the honeſt and open boldneſs of conſcious rectitude and candour. The imputation of breach of faith with thoſe who differ from them in communion, *upon principle*, has been often alledged to them with ſuch ſtupid and ſhameleſs effrontery, that it ſhould ſeem that the framers of it had alone a right to form the popiſh catechiſm, and not papiſts themſelves, who are certainly qualified to know their own religion better than all others. Theſe abſurd *inquiſitorial* creed-makers are often angry with the aſtoniſhed papiſts, for not ſubmitting, in a tame, implicit manner, to the rule of faith which they, in their great wiſdom, are pleaſed to create for them. This is not unlike *forcibly* blackening a man's face, in order to have the pleaſure of reproaching him for the deformity of his viſage; ot ſecretly pinning a paper, with the words *villain, rogue, thief*, &c. written thereon, on a man's coat, to incenſe the populace againſt him, whilſt the poor man knows nothing of the matter.

The point in queſtion is not, whether papiſts have broken their faith with proteſtants, or proteſtants with papiſts. but whether this breach of faith was authoriſed by a *real, ſettled principle*: proteſtants deny it, and are believed by papiſts; with what colour of juſtice then, can any one refuſe to render the ſame juſtice to papiſts, when they expreſs an equal abhorrence of this unexiſting tenet?—the reaſons of denial are the ſame on both ſides. The proteſtant appeals to his catechiſms, and rules of faith; ſo does the papiſt.

Papist. The former recours to the doctrine taught in protestant universities; the latter urges the same, with respect to those of his communion. In fine, there is no argument can be alledged to prove *protestant* perjury, in any instance, destitute of *principle* to authorise it, but may be made use of by papists;—to lay it entirely at the door of *irreligious villatiny*. for which no man is accountable, but he who deviates, in this respect, as much from one religion as the other. The very controversy which papists carry on, with respect to this pretended tenet of popery, which, by all the force and strength of argument, they reject and deny with execration and abhorrence, ought to be a full and sufficient proof to every man of common sense, that it belongs no more to their religion, than to believe in the visions and revelations of MAHOMET.

Nothing can be more acceptable to those who attend to the judgment of cool impartiallity and unbigotted candour, than to free themselves from the yoke of prejudice, however serviceable it may seem to the common cause to some unthinking persons. Nothing is more prudent and reasonable, than to give up freely every argument that connot be maintained without a shameful resistance to reason and conviction. As for those who are so highly delighted with their *creative* power of bugbears in popery, that any attempt to disprove their silly slanders would be construed by them into a grievous affront, it were as absurd to reason with them, as to endeavour to *convince* a man, born blind, that a negro differs in colour from an european I must not omit a very ingenious expedient for disgracing popery, by telling the world very gravely, that papists may be authorised to commit *murder*, *adultery*, &c. at a very trifling expence, by the means of certain *licences* and *dispensations*, of which our *Irish* papists are so profoundly ignorant, as to be to the last degree surprised at this wonder-

ſul extent of their liberty, which was always moſt ſhamefully concealed from them, until it was generouſly manifeſted and brought to light by a late writer, to the unſpeakable advancement of *truth*, *humanity* and *virtue*.

However, I am not without ſome *grievous apprehenſions*, that there are but too many papiſts, who, from certain *confined* and *narrow* ideas of *miſtaken tenderneſs*, and *wrong* notions of *natural mildneſs*, will be apt to reject this *eaſy* method for the *ſanctification* of actions, which, by their *indocile* diſpoſition, they will look upon in a very *criminal* light, notwithſtanding the noble encouragement they have lately received. As mildneſs is always attended with *good manners*, they will be apt to *beg* of the excellent writer who afforded them ſo boundleſs a field of liberty, that he will be ſo *indulgent* as to grant them a *licence*, and *diſtenſe* with them from believing any thing of the matter.

COSMOPOLITA.

P. S. Since I wrote the above, I met with a letter under the ſignature of *Sydney* in your paper, to whom nothing is addreſſed that is contained in the preſent letter. He is an antagoniſt of *ſuch a rank*, as to merit and challenge all the reſpect. Eſteem, and even friendſhip, that is due to one in whom the *gentleman* and the *ſcholar* are ſo happily united.

LET-

LETTER X.

NOTHING can afford a greater ſatisfaction to a man, engaged in a literary conteſt, than to meet with an antagoniſt who is willing to enter therein with all the calmneſs and candour, that muſt ever diſtinguiſh the Lover of truth, from the impetuous and wrongheaded zealot, whoſe only aim is to obtrude his notions upon the world, without a previous examination of their ſtability and firmneſs, but always utterly regardleſs of the proper, decent, and juſtifiable means to aſſert his cauſe. Such an antagoniſt as the former I hope will *Sydney* prove himſelf to be, notwithſtanding a reflection or two, which I own, I cannot help thinking ſevere, at leaſt at the firſt onſet.

He ſays, in the firſt place, that he is confident that the whole bulk of Iriſh Papiſts will be found to conſiſt of two claſſes only; the deceivers and the deceived; the impoſers and the impoſed-upon. Theſe words may be very fairly tranſlated into *Knaves* and *Fools*; and in this *reſpectable Body* muſt be included more than half of all the chriſtians in the whole world: For an Iriſh Papiſt will certainly paſs for a real Papiſt in whatever country he takes up his reſidence. As for the firſt claſs, I hope the *candour* attributed to me will be ſome kind of proof to exempt me from it; and as for the ſecond, if I be a man of *learning* (as *Sydney* kindly aſſerts) I hope it will, at leaſt, *extenuate my Folly*. And I muſt needs ſay that I hope, and even venture to think, I am not of that number.

I were ungrateful to the laſt degree, not to return my warmeſt acknowledgements to my friendly opponent, for the many unmerited praiſes he is pleaſed to beſtow on me: This is a tribute of ſuch a nature, that no difference in opinion can atone for its omiſſion.

I am,

I am, however, humble enough to think, that there are many of the popiſh perſuaſion, whoſe ſuperior merit in this, or any other literary conteſt, would much better authoriſe *Sydney's* eulogiums. My *primary* intention with regard to theſe my ſpeculations on Popery, was to prove, that Papiſts are not bound to *a foreign juriſdiction*, in any matters relative to THIS WORLD; that from their meek and peaceable demeanor, and the general happy decline of blind enthuſiaſm and imprudent extravagant zeal throughout the world, they might be reaſonably ſuppoſed to be now in a condition to live in peace, harmony and friendſhip with thoſe who happen to differ from them in ſome points, wherein the good order and welfare of any ſtate can hardly be ſuppoſed to be intereſted. As for putting Papiſts on *an abſolutely equal footing* with Proteſtants, it is (with *Sydney*'s good leave) what I never preſumed to enforce. Whatever footing they are to be on for the future (if any change at all ſhould take place in their wretched affairs) muſt be entirely and abſolutely left to the wiſdom and mercy of the legiſlature alone.

As to the firſt of *Sydney's* queries, it is ſoon anſwered. The council of Trent was indubitably the laſt general council held under the authority or preſidency of the church of Rome; which pre-eminence in councils, the Biſhops of that ſee always challenged. Let us now come to the ſecond, wherein there is occaſion for a more ample diſcuſſion. *Sydney* cannot be ignorant of the diſtinction that has been always made between points of *doctrine*, and thoſe of *diſcipline*. It is a very trite one; and yet, I fancy it will throw a great deal of light upon the preſent affair. The former then are indiſputably acknowledged by every Papiſt *at all times* and *in all circumſtances*. Theſe form the DOGMATICAL part of Popery, from whence no Papiſt can recede, and remain in that part of the communion. This conſiſts of thoſe articles

ticles which the church of Rome holds in common with Proteſtants. Such as the doctrine of the Trinity, the incarnation, &c. and thoſe of conteſted matters, ſuch as tranſubſtantiation, the invocation of ſaints, &c. on which it is needleſs to expatiate, as they are already ſufficiently well known by the writings on both ſides of the queſtion. Now I aſſert, that it is ſufficient for any Papiſt whatſoever to be a true ſon of the church of Rome, if he believes and holds the points commonly admitted, as well as the others above-mentioned, without the leaſt imaginable tincture of *gall* in his compoſition to thoſe who differ in opinion from him in matters, which, as I already obſerved, cannot affect the welfare of any ſtate. Now, if the church of Rome cheriſhes in her boſom ſuch honeſt, mild, and charitable Papiſts. who are certainly her *true*, and indeed her *beſt* children, what evil can the *dogmatical* part of Popery (in itſelf) bring on any community wherein they live? Let it be carefully taken notice of, that to avoid giving offence, I ſpeak of theſe matters, not in a *ſpiritual* light, but as far as they are relative to *temporal* concerns.

Let us now come to points of diſcipline.——The council of *Trent*, as well as all other councils, indubitably claimed the authority of enacting laws of diſcipline; and, indeed, whatever aſſembly takes upon itſelf the power of ſettling diſputed matters of *faith*, may well aſſume it in matters of much leſs conſequence —ſuch are the laws or canons of diſcipline; their great inferiority will eaſily appear, from their unſettled and fluctuating nature; unlike the former, they are far from being invariable and permanent in all times and circumſtances; nay, they depend, not infrequently, upon the will and authority of the *ſecular* Magiſtrate, to give them any degree of currency, or enforce the obedience of any individual thereto, eſpecially where the *civil power* may ſeem to be in any manner attacked in its rights. Many of them, through the

the course of time, are become quite absolete; and there are not a few which never yet obtained admission in some Popish countries. There is nothing can be collected from laws or canons so uncertain and wavering in their nature and essence, so as to give any *real* cause of uneasiness to Protestants, (let those canons be ever so severe) unless the *civil power* should afford its consent and concurrence thereto;—the absurdity of this supposition is sufficiently evident in these Protestant countries.

I am not ignorant of the many severe censures passed on those whom the church of Rome proscribed as heretics, a great number of which are to be found in the canons of councils, and papal decrees. Perhaps here lies the *principal* drift of ALL SYDNEY'S INTERROGATORIES. It is foreign to my plan to say any thing with respect to the effects of these *anathemas* in the *other* world; for I speak of *this* alone. These censures proceed from the opposition given to those *dogmatical* points which the church of Rome sought to establish. Let us now examine of what nature these censures are, of which Protestants entertain no manner of apprehension. They are fourfold, and consist in excommunication, suspension, interdict, and deprivation of church burial. These are the only weapons, the management of which the church of Rome has assumed to herself, as absolutely and inseparably annexed to her authority: As for any others, they depend for admission and execution upon the *civil powers*, whereof I do not think myself obliged to take any notice, for this *very reason*;—the distinction of the penalties of heresy, *de jure ecclesiastico*, or appertaining to the *ecclesiastical law*, and *de jure civili*, or belonging to the *civil law*, is expressly marked out in the works of the Popish canonists, among whom the celebrated *Vitus Pichler* may be consulted; tom. 5. cap de hæret. Whatever severer measures were adopted, besides those merely

ecclesiastical.

eccleſiaſtical, they certainly proceeded from the notion which Princes, in their reſpective ſtates, had of their inefficacy to ſuppreſs what they termed *innovations in religion*, and, by their declarations, thought to be noxious and deſtructive to the peace and harmony of their dominions.

As for *Pope Pius's* creed, it is, in reality, neither better nor worſe than the books mentioned by *Sydney*; therein are confirmed the dogmatical parts of Popery, of which I have already ſpoken; nor do they receive any additional ſanction by proceeding from the Pope alone, when they were eſtabliſhed by Pope and council before. It is, perhaps, *Sydney*'s notion, that Papiſts are indiſpenſably obliged to ſwallow, without any heſitation, WHATEVER PROCEEDS from the Pope; yet many of his bulls have been conteſted and rejected by very good Papiſts. This has frequently happened in France.

But let us not loſe ourſelves in a cloud of *uneſſential ſubtleties*, but bring the matter, as I firſt propoſed it, to a ſhort and plain iſſue. Whatever bull or decree ſhould be found upon examination, to contain any thing in the leaſt derogatory to the rights of Kings, directly or indirectly, may, and can, with a very ſafe conſcience, be rejected by Papiſts, as Papiſts, without departing from any one article of their faith, for which I appeal to all the tracts of divinity taught in the French univerſities, and in particular to the courſe of theology uſually delivered in the univerſity of Paris, intitled, *prelectiones theologicæ de eccleſia chriſti, quas in ſcholis ſorbonicis habuit Honoratus Tournely*, tom. 2. art. 4, wherein eccleſiaſtics are inſtructed to explode *the depoſing power*, and to inculcate ſubjection and fealty to ALL PRINCES, let their *religion be what it may*; of this any curious perſon may very readily convince himſelf; and thus all jealouſy of *popiſh* fidelity may be removed, eſpecially

ally since the most suspected papists, the *ecclesiastics* themselves, teach and approve this doctrine.

Let us now close the whole with a summary review. The canons of the council of *Trent*, and all other councils, do indeed enforce obedience to the *dogmatical* parts of popery; but, if a million of canons, decrees, bulls, creeds, &c. could be produced to attack the authority of the legislature in all civil and worldly affairs of any kind whatsoever, they could not oblige any papist living to an obedience thereto; since, as I have already proved, papists may with all imaginable safety of conscience, without ceasing in the least to be papists, refuse and reject whatever should be found, in any degree, contrary to LOYALTY, and subversive of due respect and obedience to any government under which they live.

I must here take the liberty to remind *Sydney*, that it never was my intention to consider Papists in a *religious Light*, but merely as subjects of Great-Britain.

COSMOPOLITA

LET-

LETTER XI.

NOTHING is more certain, than, that, if we form our ideas of an unpopular religion, from the writings of those whose minds are absolutely and determinately impressed with an utter abhorrence of it, we shall become partial and unjust, whether we intend it or not; and this abhorrence will rarely admit of the smallest extenuation. Thus, were I to tell an honest, but ignorant Papist, that there are some good things in the *Alcoran*, he would, no doubt be surprized, and perhaps, scandalized at the assertion.—The disciple of Mahomet would stone me for commending the doctrine and precepts of our divine law-giver.—Thus it is, unhappily, with the several sects of christians The zealots of each party (to whom the vulgar look up with a kind of superstitious veneration) entertain a most *cordial* hatred of one another, in which they also include those who adhere to their respective opponents;—not from choice, (which cannot spring from ignorance) but the accidental manner of their education, such as it happens to be. The cool endeavours of an unprejudiced writer to allay their *holy ferment*, frequently acquire him nothing but their hatred, while the *thinking few* look on, and internally wish him success, but without venturing to enter the lists, through a principle of indolence, or fear: yet are they not entirely void of effect in the present dispositions of mankind; and the candid moderation of some writers has served not a little to restrain the destructive progress of blind fanaticism. Such writers as *Hume*, *Rosseau*, *Pope* and *Voltaire*, (with some exceptions) have done infinitely more service to the world, than all the huge productions of *mystical madness*, wherein religion has been so strangely blended with the most horrible and direful excesses of the human passions. In

In the purſuit of truth, there is nothing more abſurd than to have recourſe to ſubterfuge and ſtratagem, and to lull the mind with a play of the imagination, rather than convince it by the deciſion of the judgment. Nothing is alſo more unreaſonable, than to deny the plaineſt and moſt obvious principles, for want of a better confutation. If a man can once bring himſelf to refuſe his aſſent to the moſt *vulgar* truths, all argument muſt ceaſe, and he muſt be left to the enjoyment of a ſtrange and unaccountable kind of victory. It is, indeed, amazing, that the *friend to civil and religious liberty* ſhould make ſo *extraordinary* a difficulty of admitting one of the moſt *trite* and *vulgar* diſtinctions in the world; ſo very commonly known, indeed, that no difficulty can poſſibly ariſe therein to be referred to the Pope, as he inſinuates with a quotation from *du Pin*, which (with his good leave) does not ſerve to raiſe a doubt, where none can poſſibly be admitted.

However, ſince I muſt attempt to prove what no writer was ever yet impelled to do, if this *over-ſcrupulous* gentleman will give himſelf the trouble to look over the harangue of *Ragazonus*, one of the fathers of the council of Trent, in the 9th and laſt ſeſſion thereof, he will find this ſo much conteſted diſtinction very clearly ſpecified and admitted, and the points of doctrine, (or the *dogmatical* parts of Popery) and thoſe of diſcipline, arranged in their proper order. I do not know whether I ought to inform this writer, (for perhaps he knows it without my information) that an almoſt univerſal change has very lately happened in a point of diſcipline, whereby Papiſts are diſpenſed with from hearing maſs on many holidays, to which they were before obliged, under no leſs a penalty than *mortal ſin*, as being a law calculated for, and admitted by the whole entire body of the Romiſh communion. I could likewiſe inform him, (if neceſſary) that the rigorous *penitential canons*, pre-

ſcribed

ſcribed in ſo ſolemn and ſtrict a manner by ſo many councils, (whereby the moſt ſevere faſting and prayer, with many other penitential works, were enjoined for ſeveral years, for a ſingle mortal ſin) have been ſo entirely laid aſide, on account of the very great decreaſe of fervour among chriſtians, that, were it not for hiſtory, we ſhould not know whether they ever exiſted. As my antagoniſt appears to be very fond of quotations, on every ſubject, I refer him for a clear account thereof to *inſtruſt. confeſſ. Caroli Borrom.*—Do not theſe inſtances, beſides many others that could be cited, clearly prove that there are many laws or canons in the Romiſh church liable to be aboliſhed and laid aſide?—Theſe laws obtain no other appellation among the Popiſh canoniſts and divines than *points of diſcipline*; whereas thoſe they call *doctrinal points*, or appertaining to faith, are upheld with the utmoſt exactneſs. and placed by them out of any poſſibility of change, without incurring the guilt of hereſy.

It is very extraordinary, that my antagoniſt ſhould inſinuate an *imaginary* tranſgreſſion in me, for publiſhing as *imaginary* a commentary on the council of Trent, when I only aſſerted, what that council and all other councils have admitted without the leaſt difficulty whatever, a *diſtinction* between *doctrine* and *diſcipline*, which I think ridiculous to attempt to prove if not obliged thereto, by an unreaſonable oppoſition.

If the council of Conſtance declared all Papiſts to be obliged to obey it in all matters relative to the faith, the extirpation of ſchiſm, and the general reformation of the church, what are the conſequences to be deduced therefrom? With regard to points of faith, it is only what all councils have ever claimed; but a belief in any *ſpeculative matters*, can never prejudice any ſtate. As for the extirpation of ſchiſms where *human policy* does not intervene, the only legal

 method,

methods are, to effect it by mild instruction, and above all by good example. Papists have a most profound respect for the writings of the ancient fathers; they revere them as their oracles and their guides; yet, they testify an utter abhorrence of persecution or violence, even for the defence and propagation of the faith. *If violence were to be used in defence of the faith, the bishops would oppose it* (says Hillarius, lib. 1) *It is a detestable heresy* (says Athanasius, lib. 1.) *to endeavour to compel by violence, those whom we cannot convince by reasoning. Constraint is absolutely contrary to the essence of true religion* (Justin Martyr, Lib. 5) and lastly, *let the Jews suffer no violence* (concil tolet 4. can 56) We must draw the proofs of a principle from their legal and proper sources, and not from vague and indeterminate prejudices. Papists universally teach and hold, that there is no principle of persecution in their Church, on a religious account. Their ecclesiastics themselves acknowledge the limits of their authority, even in the formidable tribunal of the Inquisition, to extend no farther than a simple examination doctrine, and a declaration thereof to the secular magistrate. Were this institution, which is only a law of some particular states, to be now entirely abolished, can we imagine, that the respective sovereigns would be declared Hereticks thereby? What then should we think of those, who would never suffer it in their dominions?

The burning of men for heresy in England, was merely a law for the secular power; and the occasions of this terrible punishment appear but too conspicuous in English history; but when they were entirely consigned to the judgment of the Church, they received very mild and gentle treatment.—— Wickliff's sentence, by Courtney, Bishop of London, and afterwards by a synod at Lambeth, was only *silence*; and he lived and died undisturbed at his parish of Lutterworth, in Leicestershire. Ayshton,

Swindurbury

Swindurbury, Dr. Rigge, Chancellor of Oxford, Rapingdon, Hereford, and others of those days, after conviction of Heterodox Opinions, had no reason to complain of a harsher treatment. But when the sectaries began to menace and shake the civil power, it was then thought necessary to enact the most coercive Laws against them. Doctor Heylin, in his animadversions on Fuller's Church-history, says, that Wickliff's Opinions were contrary to peace and good order; for he declared against the lawfulness of oaths, and required an exact probity to give a *title* to property and power, insomuch that a prince who falls into mortal sin, should lose his authority and prerogative. Hereby the fullest occasion is laid open to any ambitious designing hypocrite, who chuses to wear the mask of fanatical sanctity, to destroy his sovereign, and usurp his authority. Such Doctrines were followed by very natural consequences: The Rebellion of Jack Straw and Wat Tyler was fomented by one Ball, a priest, who adhered to many of Wickliff's opinions. Where the Lullards preached, their followers. of the better sort, such as Sir Thomas Latimer, Sir John Treffel, Sir Richard Story, Reginald Hillon, and many others, were accustomed to appear as furious disciples of *Mahomet*, than meek followers of the gospel; brandishing their swords against those who refused to join with them: But at length, in a parliament (that curtailed the power of the Pope in England) in the reign of Henry IV. on account of the many reiterated complaints of the lords and commons, the famous statute was made against the Lollards, that consigned them to the stake. Thus this dreadful punishment was merely a *defensive* engine of the civil power.

Imprisonment itself, though but for ever so short a time, could not be inflicted without the express permission of the secular Magistrate. We have, in Collier's preface to the 2nd volume of his ecclesiasti-

cal history (and he is a Proteſtant witneſs) a *licence* from Edward III. to the biſhop of London, for the impriſonment of an heretic: when any perſon, continued he, was convicted of hereſy, the biſhop petitioned the *crown* for *leave* to confine the criminal in the priſon of the dioceſe; which, it ſeems, the ordinary could not have done without ſuch an authority.

Upon the whole, my opponent's attacks ſeem chiefly levelled againſt the inquiſition, for which I never ſet up to be an advocate, as if the eſtabliſhment of it were abſolutely eſſential to Popery; whereas there are many millions of Papiſts who could never be perſuaded to admit it in their reſpective countries; for which reaſon, I ſhall not take the trouble to enter inso a particular diſcuſſion of it. Much more might be ſaid on ſo complex and intricate a ſubject, but I muſt defer it to a more favourable opportunity.

COSMOPOLITA.

LET-

LETTER. XII.

NOTHING is productive of greater mistakes, than to confound the ecclesiastical, with the civil department; yet this is commonly the case, whenever popery is to be decried for the spirit of persecution. A trifling declaimer shall harrange himself out of breath on this topic, without once laying down any settled incontestable principle, from whence alone he can extract any reasonable and solid conclusions. This, indeed, is a short and compendious method of arguing a party into every thing that is vile and execrable. But as men of sense and knowledge are generally very troublesome on these occasions, they are very apt to raise some *small* difficulties as to candour, abilities, and a proper stock of learning, to the great disadvantage and confusion of the orator. They would have a man to be versed in other histories besides those of *Lockman*, and writers of his class; and they would assert, that nothing is more equitable than to peruse carefully the arguments on both sides of the question.

The punishment of heresy in *England* took its rise, not from *canons* of councils, but from *acts of parliament* in the reigns of *Henry* IV. and *Henry* V. From the latter I will quote a few lines, that will shew how far the ecclesiastical department was concerned in that dreadful law that adjudged and sentenced heretics to the stake: "and forasmuch as the *cognizance* "of heresy, errors, and lollardries belongs to the "judges of holy church, and not to secular judges: "such persons indicted, shall be delivered to the "ordinaries of the places, or to their commissioners, "&c. to be acquit or convict by the laws of holy "church." It is evident, from this, that the *cognizance* alone of heresy was claimed and exercised by ec-

ecclesiastics, simply to examine and determine, whether such a doctrine was heretical or not. Here their authority and jurisdicton ended; and, of course, whatever ensued, must have proceeded from another principle. With regard to the discussion of doctrinal points, it is even but natural to suppose, that ecclesiastics have the best right, and are the best qualified by their condition and studies, to examine into them, and declare their opinion according to the result of their deliberations. As to spiritual censures, the power of inflicting them has been claimed by almost every sect and party, since the commencement of christianity. But the rigid disciples of *Calvin*, in particular, raised the ecclesiastical authority to the highest degree, so far as to destroy and annihilate the civil. It is well known with what inflexible obstinacy they always contended for their most unbounded and unreasonable religious prerogatives. When the seizure of king *James* at *Ruthven*, in 1582, in favour of the clergy, was legally declared to be *treason*, an assembly of ministers and elders made a most rigorous opposition, and even ordained all those to be *excommunicated* who should coincide with that declaration, although as solemn as law could make it.

The synod of *Dort* exercised the power of censuring doctrines, and excommunicating heretics; in consequence of which many suffered death. A very warm persecution was raised over the united provinces against the *Arminians*; many of whom then fled for shelter to *France*. *Calvin* himself, with unabating resolution, maintained and supported the most enormous ecclesiastical pretensions. The council of two hundred at *Geneva* had reserved to the senate the final judgment in the causes of excommunication, together with the absolution therefrom. One *Bertelier*, an excommunicated person, petitioned the senate to be absolved, which was complied with; but *Calvin* no sooner came to the knowledge of it, than he mount-

ed

ed the pulpit, where, with the utmoſt vehemence, he declared that he would oppoſe force to force, and rather be maſſacred than offer the holy myſteries to thoſe who were adjudged unworthy of them; and the event was, that he *obliged* the ſenate *to acquieſe* to his determination.

Thus we ſee that the ſpiritual power in an unlimited latitude, was exerciſed by *others* as well as by the church of *Rome*, inſomuch as even to *compel* all the weight and authority of the *civil* power to yield to its boundleſs influence; but popiſh eccleſiaſtics, by their *doctrine*, acknowledge a due diſtinction between the authority of the church and that of the ſecular magiſtrate, and openly profeſs that their power extends no farther than a ſimple declaration of doctrine, whether good or bad. Whatever enſues in conſequence of other laws by *another* authority, from whence they are kept totally diſtinct, they think themſelves not accountable for, and if they would, they cannot hinder the civil power from ſecuring itſelf from the many dangers of ſeditious and rebellious doctrines, which might in time perhaps overturn the ſtate. But have not ſome eccleſiaſtics, forgetting that meekneſs which ſhould be inſeparably annexed to their character and office, ſometimes puſhed matters too far, and purſued perhaps involuntary error, with more malevolence than chriſtian zeal? I will anſwer candidly, that I believe they have done ſo; and by exceeding the limits of their duty, have forfeited that ſpirit of mildneſs and charity, which forms the principal and moſt beautiful part in the character of a miniſter of the goſpel.

But the church of *Rome* does not want for illuſtrious examples of moderation and forbearance, even when the greateſt incentives to revenge were added to an abhorrence of oppoſite doctrines; while ſome in queen *Mary*'s days unhappily gave a looſe to the deſtructive ſpirit of reſentment and vengeance; many popiſh biſhops,

ſhops, who had been turned out of their ſees, and treated with all manner of contempt and ignominy, totally forbore perſecution, and they were then, as they are now, conſidered by their own party as the true ornaments of the epiſcopal dignity. Neither *Heathe*, archciſhop of *York*, nor *Ogletborpe*, biſhop of *Carliſle*, exerciſed any ſeverity on the ſcore of religion. The biſhops of *Glouceſter*, *Oxford*, *Hereford*, and *Worceſter*, refuſed to engage in perſecution, although the warmeſt friends to the reformation, allow that many zealots in thoſe days committed ſeveral irritating extravagancies, ſuch as aſſaulting prieſts even in the moſt ſolemn acts of religion, and abuſing whatever the papiſts held as ſacred. The proteſtant hiſtorian, *Collier*, relates many inſtances of the kind in his eccleſiaſtical hiſtory.

Alphonſus, a *Spaniard* and a friar, confeſſor to king *Philip*, preached vehemently againſt taking away people's lives for religion. He even laſhed at the perſecuting party, with the keeneſt ſatire, and ſharply upbraided them for burning thoſe who could believe no better, inſtead of inſtructing them in meekneſs, which was the *only* proper rule they had to follow.

The illuſtrious cardinal *Pole*, whom *Hume* places at the head of the mild and moderate party, was entirely averſe to the perſecuting ſpirit, and laboured to ſtop is pernicious effects, for which his very opponents, as well as for the luſtre of his many other virtues, could not help conſidering him as a truly good and pious eccleſiaſtic, at the ſame time that they looked upon him as a bad *politician*. Thus this latter wretched character bore the ſway in their minds, even againſt all that collective body of virtues which nevertheleſs they could not but revere and eſteem.

In the ſynod held in queen *Mary*'s reign, for the reeſtabliſhment of church diſcipline, there was no order or intimation given to the biſhops, or parochial clergy,

gy, for the purpoſe of *perſecution*, and this is taken notice of by doctor *Burnet*.

Thus, when religion came really in queſtion. Perſecution was far from being conſidered as any part thereof: let us therefore impute it to its real ſource, the ſpirit of revenge predominating over the ſalutary mildneſs of religion and the goſpel.

The friend to *civil and religious liberty* ſeems to quarrel even with the moſt *real* and neceſſary *diſtinctions*; but, if we take matters in the groſs, we cannot ſurely come to a right knowledge of any truth; and thus learning and reaſon itſelf will be abuſed, and only ſpeak the language of our prejudices.

COSMOPOLITA.

FINIS.

A

CATALOGUE

OF

BOOKS,

Printed and ſold by RICHARD ENNIS, at No. 67. the corner of the Market-Houſe, DUBLIN.

WHERE he ſells by Wholeſale and Retail all Sorts of Bibles, Teſtaments, Common-prayres, together with a great Variety of claſical and other books,—ſuch as Diſpenſatories, Virgil, Horris, Salmon's Geography, Salmon's Gazetteer, Ovid De triſtebus, Gay's Fables, Boyle's Pantheon, Circle of Sciences, Boyer's French Dictionary, Boyer's French Grammar, Don Quixote, Cicero's Orations, Congraves Works, Pope's ditto, Hervey's Meditations, Dánois Fairy Tales 3 vols. Marſhal's Letters, Weymoth's Letters, Hervey's Dialogues, Sentimental Journey, Clarke's Magazine, Attorney's pocketbook, Leed's Lucian,——Boyle's Voyages. Barrow's ditto, Becket's do. Byron's do. Anſon's do. Yorrick's Jeſts,

Jests, Miller's and Johnson's ditto. Latin Testament, French ditto. Greek Grammars. Lilly and Whetnal's Grammars and Constructions. Latin and English Garretsons. Hoole's Terminations. Cordery, Syntax. Prosady. Latin Salust, with an assortment of Novels and Histories, viz.

brook's Gazetteer	Voster's Arithmetic
Johnson's Dictionary	Cocker s ditto
Dyche's Dictionary,	Fisher's ditto
Gough's ditto	Double Comes Commercii
Fenning's ditto	Death of Able
Cocker's Spelling-book	Vicar of Wakefield
Harris's Book-keeping	David Simple
Dowling's ditto	Young Man's best Companion
Mair's ditto	Clark's Ovid
Gibson's Surveying	Spectator
Hawney's Measurer	Beauties of ditto
Brown's Gng. Expositor	Mrs, Teachum
Children's Bible	Guardian's and Tatlers
Double and single Weeks Preparations	Æsop's Fables
Clark's Introduction	Patrick O'Donnell, &c.

Horn-books and Toys for Children, with many other Books too tedious to mention.

He also sells the newest and most approved Spelling Books, such as Watt's, Dylworth's Dyche's, and Fenning's, with all Kinds of Stationary Ware. He binds Merchant's Ledgers and Account Books, neat and strong, and keeps an Assortment ready made.—Good Encouragement is given to country Merchants and others who buy to sell again. He also gives the highest Price for old Books and Gentlemens Liberaries.

A Variety of Letter-cases, aed Pocket-books.

☞ The best HOLMAN's INK-POWDER, sold by said *ENNIS.*